UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,296	01/24/2002	R. Eric Montgomery	P1083US01	9773

53096 7590 07/25/2007

DISCUS DENTAL IMPRESSIONS, INC.
8550 HIGUERA STREET
CULVER CITY, CA 90232

EXAMINER
JAGOE, DONNA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1614	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/056,296	MONTGOMERY, R. ERIC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Donna Jagoe	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7,11-13,16-35,37-39,41-43 and 45-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *47-54* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7,11-13,16-35,37-39,41-43,45 and 46* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments filed October 2, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-13, 16-35, 37-39, 41-43, 45-54 are pending in this application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-5, 7, 11-13, 16-35, 37-39, 41-43 and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Show Denko KK JP 62096408 in view of Pera U.S. Patent No. 4,775,525. and Elliott et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,011,682.

The claims are drawn to a composition comprising ascorbyl-2-phosphate or a sodium or potassium salt thereof and further comprising calcium ions wherein the composition is mixed with an orally acceptable carrier, and further comprising a calcium chelating agent, a pyrophosphate, tripolyphosphate or polyphosphate tartar control agent, a water soluble fluid, water soluble solid, humectant, thickener, surfactant, sweetener, flavorant, colorant, abrasive, stabilizer, fluoride containing compound, anticaries agent, antimicrobial agent, essential oil and a desensitizing agent.

Showa Denko KK teach ascorbic acid phosphoric acid ester or it's salt (e.g. Na^+, K^+, Ca^{++} or Mg^+ salt) in an oral composition to be used for alveolar pyorrhea, cleaning teeth, removing bad breath and washing the teeth. It is in compositions such as toothpaste, chewing gum and troches. Working example I teaches calcium diphosphate dihydrate (source of calcium/abrasive), sodium carboxymethylcellulose and carrageenan (thickeners), glycerin (water soluble liquid), sorbital (water soluble solid), fragrance (flavor), preservative (antimicrobial), sodium saccharin (sweetener), sodium lauryl sulfate (surfactant), and ascorbic acid magnesium phosphate.

Showa Denko does not teach the desensitizing agents of claims 40-44, it does not teach the non water-soluble solid and liquid and it does not teach the pyrophosphate, tripolyphosphate or polyphosphate tartar control agent.

Pera (4,775,525) teaches strontium as a desensitizing agent for the teeth (column 5, lines 27-43).

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time it was made to incorporate desensitizing agents and vegetable oils and wax. Such a modification would have been motivated by the reasoned expectation of producing a dentifrice composition which is effective in comprehensively cleaning teeth and desensitizing teeth of individuals that have become sensitized. Strontium is a well-known desensitizer, which is known and used in dentifrices as evidenced by the teachings of Pera (4,775,525). Vegetable oil would aid in mixing the dentifrice composition and the wax would effectively coat the teeth and add shine to the teeth.

Elliott et al. teach Soluble inorganic pyrophosphate salts have over the last few years set the commercial standard as tartar control agents (column 1, lines 26-31) and teach tartar control agents such as disodium pyrophosphate, dipotassium pyrophosphate, tetrapotassium pyrophosphate, tetrasodium pyrophosphate to a dentifrice composition (column 5, lines 5-16).

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time it was made to incorporate the instantly recited tartar control agents. Such a modification would have been motivated by the reasoned expectation of producing a dentifrice composition, which is effective in comprehensively cleaning teeth and removing tartar. As stated in Elliott, the pyrophosphate tartar control agents have set the commercial standard and are known and used in dentifrices as evidenced by the teachings of Elliott et al.

Applicant claims a pH of the composition from about 5.5 to about 10.0 now in independent claim 1. However, if applicant wishes to rely on provisional application number 60/263884 ,for a priority date of 1/24/01, the only pH present in the priority document is a teaching of a pH of 8.86 in one specific formulation. There is no recitation of a pH of from about 5.5 to about 10 .

See http://pubs.acs.org/hotartcl/chemtech/95/dec/dec.html December 1995 wherein it is recited that Sodium fluoride, sodium monofluorophosphate, and stannous fluoride are the most common fluoride sources used in toothpaste. Great care must be taken in the formulation of these agents so that their anticaries activity is not reduced by other dentifrice ingredients, such as the abrasive system. For example, whereas sodium

monofluorophosphate is compatible with both silica and dicalcium phosphate dihydrate abrasives, sodium fluoride is most compatible with the silica abrasive at neutral pH values. Thus it would have been obvious to employ a pH of 5.5 to 10 since this range encompasses neutral pH's and this would be most compatible for formulations with fluoride.

New Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13, 35, 39, 43 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131

USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 13 recites the broad recitation "wherein the tartar control agent comprises from about 0.1% to about 10%", and the claim also recites "or from about 1% to about 4%" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 35 recites the broad recitation "wherein the anticaries agent comprises from about 0.1% to about 4% by weight of the composition", and the claim also recites "or from about 0.2% by weight to about 0.8%" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since

the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 39 recites the broad recitation "wherein the antimicrobial agent comprises from about 0.01% to about 2% by weight of the composition", and the claim also recites "or from about 0.1% to about 1% by weight of the composition" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely

exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 43 recites the broad recitation "wherein the desensitizing agent comprises potassium nitrate in an amount of from about 3% to about 6% by weight of the composition", and the claim also recites "or in an amount of about 5% by weight of the composition" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Regarding claim 46 the markings to show the Changes in the claim is unclear. All claims being currently amended must be presented with markings to indicate the changes that have been made relative to the immediate prior version. The changes in any amended claim must be shown by strikethrough (for deleted matter) or underlining (for added matter) with 2 exceptions: (1) for deletion of five or fewer consecutive characters, double brackets may be used (e.g., [[eroor]]); (2) if strike-through cannot be easily perceived (e.g., deletion of number "4" or certain punctuation marks), double brackets must be used (e.g., [[4]]). As an alternative to using double brackets, however, extra portions of text may be included before and after text being deleted, all in strikethrough, followed by including and underlining the extra text with the desired change (e.g., ~~number 4 as~~ number 14 as). See MPEP § **714** 700-239 Rev. 5, Aug. 2006. In instant claim 46, currently amended, there are confusing bracketing, especially in approximately line 4 of the claim after the number 10 and before the semicolon there is an "open parentheses" and then in the next line, there is another "open parentheses".

It is unclear to the examiner what is deleted subject matter and what subject matter is still present by the confusing bracketing of claim 46.

Newly submitted claims 47-54 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the claims are directed to a method for reducing tooth sensitivity, counteracting tooth decay or assisting in the regenerative process of periodontal tissues and a method for the prevention of tooth stain accumulation. A new search would be required to determine patentability of these method claims.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 47-54 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Applicant states

that one of skill in the art would not be motivated to look in an article generally describing toothpaste to suggest the present invention of an oral care composition including an ascorbyl 2 phosphate compound. If Applicant disagrees with the rejections, Applicant should discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. Obviousness presumes ordinary skill in the pertinent art. It is well within the skill of the artisan to reference compatibilities for *inter alia* toothpaste formulations. Secondly, applicant asserts that the reference merely suggests that a neutral pH may be tried. On the contrary, the reference states "Sodium fluoride, sodium monofluorophosphate, and stannous fluoride are the most common fluoride sources used in toothpaste. Great care must be taken in the formulation of these agents so that their anticaries activity is not reduced by other dentifrice ingredients, such as the abrasive system. For example, whereas sodium monofluorophosphate is compatible with both silica and dicalcium phosphate dihydrate abrasives, sodium fluoride is most compatible with the silica abrasive at neutral pH values".

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donna Jagoe whose telephone number is (571) 272-0576. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 A.M. - 3:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Donna Jagoe
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1614

July 20, 2007

Frederick Krass
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614